DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 412 503 CS 012 936

AUTHOR	Freppon, Penny A.; McIntyre, Ellen
TITLE	From Emergent to Conventional Reading: Similarities and Differences in Children's Learning in Skills-based and Whole Language Classrooms.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1997-03-00
NOTE	51p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
CONTRACT	G0087202299; R117E00134
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142) - Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; Comparative Analysis; *Conventional Instruction; *Instructional Effectiveness; Longitudinal Studies; Primary Education; Public Schools; Reading Attitudes; Reading Habits; *Reading Instruction; Reading Motivation; Reading Research; *Reading Strategies; Urban Schools; *Whole Language Approach
IDENTIFIERS	*Reading Behavior

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to compare children's acquisition and use of reading strategies and their evolving stance toward reading in two instructional settings, skills-based and whole language. The authors used test-score and descriptive data to select case study children who represented a range of reading development, e.g., from emergent (least proficient) to conventional (most proficient). The authors observed and tape-recorded the subjects in-class reading samples twice weekly during the second half of first grade, an active period of development in beginning reading. The children were also given a controlled, common reading task outside the classroom for comparison purposes. Children's reading strategies and stance toward literacy were coded and studied for the commonly known strategies such as self-correction and substitutions that are meaningful and have letter/sound correspondence, and other motivation-related responses such as effort, persistence, and willingness to take on difficult reading tasks. The children in the constructivists-based whole language classroom used more reading strategies and exhibited patterns of a positive stance demonstrated through perseverance and courage in the face of challenging reading as well as persistence and effortful application of strategies such as self-correcting, etc. These results provide insight into some characteristics of young children's development in learning to read that are not often researched. (Contains 60 references.) (Author/CRW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* From the original document. *
****

ED 412 503

Penny A. Freppon
University of Cincinnati
College of Education ML 2
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0002
phone: 513-556-3574
fax: 513-556-2483

Ellen McIntyre
University of Louisville
School of Education
Louisville KY 40208
phone: 502-588-0576
fax: 502-852-0726

From Emergent to Conventional Reading: Similarities and Differences in Children's Learning in Skills-Based and Whole Language Classrooms

Running Head: From Emergent to Conventional Reading

The contents of this paper were developed under Grant No. G0087202299 and R117E00134 of the Department of Education, however these contents do not represent the policy of the U.S. Department of Education and should not be interpreted as such.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
P. Freppon
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS012936

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to compare children's acquisition and use of reading strategies and their evolving stance stance toward reading in two instructional settings, skills-based and whole language. We used test-score and descriptive data to select case study children who represented a range of reading development, e.g., from emergent (least proficient) to conventional (most proficient). We observed and tape-recorded their in-class reading samples twice weekly during the second half of first grade, an active period of development in beginning reading. We also gave the children a controlled, common reading task outside the classroom for comparison purposes. Children's reading strategies and stance toward literacy were coded and studied for the commonly known strategies such as self-correction and substitutions that are meaningful and have letter/sound correspondence, and other motivation-related responses such as effort, persistence, and willingness to take on difficult reading tasks. The children in the constructivists-based whole language classroom used more reading strategies and exhibited patterns of a positive stance demonstrated through perseverance and courage in the face of challenging reading as well as persistence and effortful application of strategies such as self-correcting, etc. These results provide insight into some characteristics of young children's development in learning to read that are not often researched.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

From Emergent to Conventional Reading: Similarities and Differences in Children Learning in Skills-Based and Whole Language Classrooms

In their award winning book, The Manufactured Crisis (1995), Berlinger and Biddle challenge the notion of a wide-spread uniform literacy crisis. However, their research also shows that schools' failure to improve literacy falls disproportionately on poor and minority students. Numerous studies have shown discrepancies between the achievement of low-SES children and that of middle-class children (Miller, 1997). In his comprehensive analysis of this educational achievement gap, Miller explains how variations in school structure, curricula, teacher expectations, and instruction contribute to the school failure of low-socioeconomic populations and how schools can be restructured to address the problem.

One promising area of reforming schools for young low-SES children addressed by Miller and many other educators has been to more closely match instruction to how children learn (Au, 1997; Cambourne, 1988; Clay, 1991; Tharp & Gallimore, 1993). Decades of research has facilitated a transformation in the way we understand human learning and young children's development in learning to read. Learning is no longer viewed as the transmission of knowledge that positions learners in the role of passive receivers. Rather, learning is viewed as the construction of knowledge built on students' current cognitive structures (schemes) that enable them to interpret new information. The constructivist view of learning puts learners in the role of active participants. Teachers holding this view expect children to take on the role of active participant and be responsible readers. Research shows (Green & Meyer, 1991; Edwards & Mercer, 1987) that teachers' expectations and the classrooms they create have significant influence on learning; the classroom-culture effect

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

occurs through interaction with the environment and others. Another person often serves as a guide who provides necessary support to the learner until the learner can complete a task independently. This notion of scaffolding and the social nature of learning is based on Vytotsky's (1956) theory of learning. In further discussing the role of social factors, Vygotsky (1978) holds that children grow into the intellectual life around them (p. 88).

In the last few years constructivist theories and resulting instructional practices have increasingly come under attack, especially in the field of reading and reading acquisition. The so-called reading wars that began with Flesch's Why Johnny Can't Read (1956) have been raging again (see Author & _____in press for further discussion). Currently there is a different argument about beginning reading instruction. That is, the issue is whether or not whole language (constructivist-based or phonics-based) methods are best for helping children learn to read. Skeptics about whole language argue that there are few comparative studies clearly showing that children in whole language classrooms learn to read as well or better than children in classrooms with a skills approach (McKenna, Stahl & Reinking, 1994; McKenna, Robinson, & Miller, 1994). Very recently (Steinberg,1998) a national research report has documented the value of constructivist-based early reading instruction and recommended a combination of phonics and whole language. This report also calls for an end to the reading wars and *a best method* argument about reading instruction.

While a-best-method argument is to be avoided for all the obvious reasons, research on children's reading in different instructional settings is needed to contribute to better understanding of the complexities of early literacy development. We need to study young children's learning with a focus on the sense making patterns they demonstrate. This study seeks to contribute to the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

field by investigating six low-SES, urban children's development in reading in two different instructional settings: a traditional, skills-based first grade, and a constructivist-based, whole language first grade. We compared three children from a skills-based first grade (Audrey, Mary Ann, and Rodney) to three children from a whole language first grade (Charlie, Ann, and Jason) who were matched on incoming literacy knowledge as assessed on a battery of tasks and tests in a larger, long-term research project (Purcell-Gates & Dahl, 1992; ____& Author, 1995; Author, 1992; Author & Author, 1994).

In the current study, comparisons were made on the children's reading strategies and stance toward reading. We defined reading strategies as children's use of print knowledge such as using letter/sound correspondence and other visual cues, self-correcting, re-reading, using syntax, and word analogies. Stance was defined as motivation-related responses that include children's effort, engagement, persistence, and even their courage in the face of challenging reading. The study took place in the latter part of first grade as the children moved toward conventional reading. These data will be discussed in light of current literature on young children's reading acquisition and motivation in literacy.

Reading Acquisition and Motivation in Literacy

As children emerge as readers, they use the knowledge gained during their pre-school and in-school years about written language to construct meaning from print. Research from several studies converge to show that emergent reading is characterized by stages or phases of development. For example, children focus on pictures first, then later on the text (Biemiller, 1970; Clay, 1992; Dyson, 1991, Juel, Griffith, & Gough, 1986; Sulzby, 1985). Sulzby (1985) showed that as children read texts they often begin by reading from memory, particularly if they have favorite storybooks. Her work also contributed

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to what we know of early emergent reading strategies, e.g. skipping words, and using a mix of text information and invented text to create a story-like reading. Later, children acquire print concepts such as wordness or phonemic segmentation (Clay, 1991), and come to focus attention on letter-sound relationships, sometimes to the exclusion of other concepts needed for reading (Biemiller; 1970; Sulzby, 1985). As children develop as readers they exhibit various strategies (e.g., focusing on re-reading, self correcting, etc.) in an effort to gain control of the reading process (Clay, 1991). As development proceeds and children learn to use their new found phonological knowledge and integrate it with meaning-construction strategies, they are said to have "orchestrated" (Dyson, 1991, p. 120) the reading process and are on their way to conventional reading (Sulzby, 1985).

Thus, as children move toward conventional reading, they synthesize knowledge and skills and begin to objectify written language (Sulzby & Teale, 1991). This learning is highly complex, but it becomes observable when texts are reflected on and manipulated. For example, when children consciously use alphabetic knowledge to decode words in their construction of meaning they are combining English orthography and reading strategies in a metacognitive way (Sulzby & Teale, 1991). Objectifying written language is also evident when readers engage in motivated-related responses such as sustaining effort to construct whole texts and persevering in challenging reading.

As conventional readers further internalize print knowledge and the reading process, they become able to verbalize their comprehension strategies (Baker & Brown, 1984; Paris, Lipson, & Wixson, 1983; Paris, Wasik, & Turner, 1991; Pearson & Fielding, 1991). Strategies such as using feedback, monitoring, recognizing new words through words already known, as well as re-reading and self-correcting are all signs of fluent, flexible reading. Clay (1991)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

discusses readers with these characteristics as those who have gained "inner control" (p. 258). For example, when a child omits, inserts, or changes words as he or she reads, the child is using strategies to keep the activity going (Clay, 1991). These responses are signs of a good reader or one who is highly likely to become a good reader if these responses continue (Stanovich, 1986).

The instruction children receive has a marked impact on how they use and manipulate the phonological knowledge that is part of the instructional focus (Clay, 1991; Author & Author, 1994). For example, in a skills-based and whole language comparison study of the same three children we studied in the current investigation, Author & Author (1994) found that children from whole language classrooms developed alphabetic knowledge in ways highly similar to those in the skill-based settings. However, the children from the whole language settings made use of their knowledge to a greater extent. The teacher's instructional orientation also affects whether children transfer concepts and skills learned in one context, such as reading with the teacher, to another context such as reading independently (Author, 1992).

Literacy research has taken up children's motivation with increasing interest (Almasi, McKeown, & Beck 1996; Gurthie, et. al, 1993, 1996; Oldfather and Dahl, 1994; Turner, 1995). With this interest has come the recognition that the motivation-related development of young readers is important and in need of further research. Qualitative studies provide a body of rich description needed to better understand the complexities of motivated reading (Pintrich & DeGroot, 1990). For example, Turner's (1995) work extended over a one year period in two different kinds of instruction (skills -based and literature-based). Her study showed that the children in the literature-based instruction exhibited more motivated behaviors. In her conclusions, Turner (1995) argued for a reciprocal relationship between cognitive/motivational processes in the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

classroom experiences of young children. Corno & Snow (1986) discuss motivation itself as thinking. Deep thinking/affective processing takes place as children reason about and with written language. Moreover, students must consciously participate in this processing to learn to value learning (Corno & Rohrkemper, 1985). In the current study we combined cognitive and motivational data gathered in an important period in first grade.

Oldfather and Dahl (1994) hold that intrinsic motivation for literacy is a sociocognitive and affective learning process that co-occurs as children experience a classroom culture. These researchers argue that the artificial separation of literacy motivation from learning experiences has lead to a common misperception that views motivation as something that is done to children, rather than something that comes out of children's own inclinations or stance (p.140). Oldfather and Dahl describe a three-part transacting construct that includes intrinsic motivation as inseparable from the learning process and culture. These domains are non-linear and exist in a relationship that is dynamic and ecological (Lyons, 1990). The domains consist of the classroom culture that provides socially meaningful and relevant contexts, an interpersonal domain that addresses relationships among learners and learning with and from others, and an intrapersonal domain that is individual and ever evolving and transacting with the other two. Oldfather and Dahl's argument is highly consistent with Deci and Ryan's (1987; 1991) view on motivation. Oldfather and Dahl propose that learner's beliefs about themselves (the self) represents a growth process that integrates individual experiences with "relatedness" of self and others. These researchers argue for a constructivist view of the child as the principle agent in his/ her own motivation and academic learning. The current study provides some insights into the view proposed by Oldfather and Dahl (1994). Specifically, it investigates affective learning processes (motivation-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

related reading response) in different classroom cultures while accounting for other factors known to influence reading.

Bergin and LaFave's (in press) analysis found a converging of two domains, namely motivation and literacy learning. They claim that this convergence provides evidence for effective classroom practice (p. 2). These researchers studied the characteristics of whole language philosophy and practice and found it compatible with the motivation literature. Context (the classroom) strongly affects the factors congruent with motivation such as learner goals, personal agency beliefs, level of challenge, and emotions. When children are motivated to read in the face of great difficulty they objectify and bravely manipulate the text. In becoming conventional readers, young children learn essential skills such as decoding and comprehending, however, they also learn to will the means to read. Their will is demonstrated when they take on reading challenges, and 'will' here accords with Wittrock's (1986) definition of motivation itself as a process of initiating, sustaining, and directing action. The kind of readers we hope that all children become find the activity of reading rewarding. Their reinforcement lies within the reading process itself (Clay, 1991).

As noted above, the current investigation matched case studies of six children. They represented a range of reading development (from most to least experienced) . Matched case studies were defined as follows: One child from skills-based instruction matched with one child from whole language instruction with both children having very similar entering school knowledge in kindergarten. We focused the current investigation on the second semester of first grade during the period in which the six children moved toward conventional reading. However, we used our research conducted throughout kindergarten and all of first grade to ensure consistency of instruction and in the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

case-study matching process. The research questions focused on what these matched case-study children did with their emergent reading knowledge. Specifically we wanted to investigate their stance toward reading and the strategies they knew and used in two parallel circumstances. These circumstances were (a) a controlled reading sample with the researchers, and (b) ordinarily occurring independent classroom reading.

Method

The research sites were two urban public schools in a large midwestern city. Both schools had high mobility rates and a large percentage of children on the federally sponsored lunch program. These schools served a majority population of white Urban Appalachians with a history of migration from rural areas into industrialized cites, a history of school failure, and a low-socioeconomic status (Flowler, 1981).

The classrooms, instruction, and research observations. The skills-based and constructivist-based kindergarten and first grade classrooms were selected through multiple data sources including interviews and classroom observations. The teachers in the constructivist-based classrooms were identified by their principals as good constructivist-based / whole language teachers and the teachers identified themselves as whole language teachers. The skills-based teachers were also identified by their principals as good traditional teachers. The teachers identified themselves also as traditional with highly skill-focused instruction.

The classrooms closely matched the criteria for skills-based instruction and a whole language approach which had been verified in previous research (DeFord, 1984; Author, 1991; Moss, 1983). The skills-based classroom reflected the idea that children must have systematic, hierarchically-ordered skills instruction in order to learn to read. The instruction reflected a bottom-up,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

transmission approach. For example, both the kindergarten and first-grade skill-based classroom cultures demonstrated the expectation that children were to receive the pre-determined, scope and sequence of instruction and transfer it directly into their own reading behaviors. The classroom teachers indicated that they believed children need to first learn letter /sound correspondences and sight words before they could learn to read. Instructional techniques and materials followed the scope and sequence of the textbooks. Daily classroom life was characterized by (a) children working alone at their desks completing routine assignments, (b) minor and irregular use of children's literature, and (c) whole class and small group basal reading instruction. In addition, children sometimes read on their own after assignments were completed or when attendance was taken.

In contrast, the constructivist-based, whole language classrooms reflected the idea that children learn literacy skills and other important concepts and responses through their own engagement in reading, writing, and talking. For example, the kindergarten and first-grade teachers consistently indicated that they believed children need self-selected, meaningful, collaborative, and varied experiences to help them learn to read. In addition, these teachers also held that teacher-initiated explicit instruction is important to emergent and beginning reading e.g. they consistently taught phonics explicitly and in context. Classroom observations verified these beliefs in routine practice. Daily classroom life was characterized by (a) children working together and independently on self-selected activities and teacher assignments; (b) high use of children's literature and children writing on their own topics for extended periods, and (c) children reading self-selected books, being read to by teachers, and reading and writing with teachers in small groups. These two teachers were balanced in their instruction (Author, 1996). Their instruction included both

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

teacher and child initiated literacy events, reading/writing skills and literature engagements, and the teachers' instruction was consistent with whole language philosophy.

As part of the larger research project, we observed the children in the mornings from September through May during kindergarten and first grade. The first author was in the whole language site and the second author in the skills-based site. The children wore a remote microphone which captured their oral reading and talk, along with some peers' and teachers' talk. We observed the instruction and the children's behaviors, writing field notes and elaborating them with audio-taped recordings. We included photocopied artifacts (texts read and written) in these elaborated field notes.

Participants . Audrey and Charlie, Mary Ann and Jason, and Ann and Rodney were matched as case studies because they had similar written language knowledge at the beginning of kindergarten and had similar reading development in first grade. All of the six children were low-SES, white, Urban Appalachian. The lists below show the matched case studies and the kinds of instruction these children received. All discussion of matched case studies in this article refers to the pairs of children below

Skills-based		Constructivist-Based/whole language
Audrey	and	Charlie
Mary Ann	and	Jason
Rodney	and	Ann

The test indicators discussed below helped determine the children's written language experience upon entering school. Based on these indicators Audrey, from the skill-based classroom and Charlie from the whole language

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

classroom were the most experienced learners; Mary Ann (skills-based) and Jason (whole language) were less experienced; and Rodney (skills-based) and Ann (whole language) were the least experienced. During the first two years of schooling, these six learners demonstrated the reading behaviors commonly seen in emergent to conventional reading patterns (Sulzby, 1985). They also differed in proficiency, with some of these six children learning to read more readily. For example, during first grade Audrey and Charlie read conventionally months before Rodney and Ann.

Evidence of the six children's written language knowledge was obtained through kindergarten pre-tests and in post tests at the end of first grade. These tests tapped entering kindergarten knowledge on Intentionality (knowing that print carries meaning), Story Structure (beginning, middle, and end), Written Register (knowledge of text-like words and phrases), Alphabetical principle (concepts on letter/sound relations), Concepts About Print (left to right directionality, etc. (Clay, 1979), Concepts of Writing (writing as a system, using drawing, writing letter-like forms). In this study four of the six measures were pertinent and are displayed in the table below. The higher numbers indicate a better score. (For discussion of these tests, method, and scoring, see Purcell-Gates, 1989.) The measures used in the current study are abbreviated in the table as follows I (intentionality), SS (story structure), AP (alphabetic principle), and CP (concepts about print).

(Insert Table One about here)

Previous research has established the importance of alphabetic knowledge in learning to read (Cunningham & Stanovich,1993; Ehri, 1995; Perfetti, Beck,Bell, & Hughes, 1987; Stanovich, Cunningham, & Freeman, 1984). For the purposes of this study, the alphabetic score was considered to be

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the most salient indicator. The matched case studies (Audrey and Charlie, Mary Ann and Jason, and Rodney and Ann) were matched exactly on alphabetic principle. The Intentionality score was used as a second important indicator of experience with written language; it, too, is supported by previous research (Purcell-Gates & Dahl, 1991). The three paired cases were well matched on this indicator. Audrey and Charlie were within one point, Mary Ann and Jason within two points, and Rodney and Ann matched exactly. On story structure and Concepts of Print (Clay, 1979) we judged the children to be sufficiently similar.

Data Collection and Analysis

In addition to the pre- and post tests done with each of the six focal learners, we gathered and analyzed data from several other sources. These included classroom observations and artifacts, audio-taped recordings of classroom participation, and audio-taped recordings of out-of-classroom reading of common texts. A summary of the procedures used in this research follows.

We observed in these classrooms twice weekly for approximately two hours each visit, taking field notes. The first author was in the whole language classroom and the second author was in the skills-based classroom. Observations were predominantly non-participatory, and we focused on one focal child during each visit. We sat physically close to the child, recorded what the child did and what his or her teacher did, noted the child's interactions, and documented the materials the child used. The observed child wore a remote microphone to enable us to capture all reading attempts. We also photocopied the texts the children read. Through repeated review (Glaser, 1978) of the classroom data, we identified telling classroom reading samples representative of each child's reading process. Detailed analysis of these episodes follows in this section.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In January of first grade, we conducted a controlled, tape recorded reading event with each of the six children. The children were asked to read from an I Can Read book (Bonsall, 1963; 1965). Little or no help was given to the children. These reading samples were analyzed by an outside expert using Clay's (1979) Running Record. The identities of the children and their instruction were masked.

Analysis of reading sample. We analyzed children's day-to-day, independent classroom reading samples for strategies and stance toward literacy. Examples of codes on stance were P (persisted, child continued, or started over in difficult reading), S(smiled, enjoys, shows personal involvement), M (metacognitive comments on text, plans reading, e.g. " I'm going to....") and A (avoided, child looked away, changed topics), PY (passivity, doesn't seem to try or care). Examples of reading strategy codes were SC (self-corrects), RR (re-reads), SW/ M (meaningful substitution, or other, consistent with letter/sound, meaning, syntax). Codes such as P, S, and SC indicated reflection and/or objectification. A greater number of codes such as P, M, RR, and S, and an absence of codes such as A and PY documented a pattern. Such patterns identified strategy use and/or a positive stance toward literacy.

The first-grade classroom reading samples from January through May were closely studied for: (a) early and beginning reading behaviors described by Sulzby (1985) and Clay (1979), and (b) other in-process literacy behaviors that emerged. For example, some data helped documented children's strategy use such as alphabetic knowledge; and some documented stance responses such as persistence. Finally, we met our goals by the coding and analysis of miscues and in-process talk and action (Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987).

As noted above, we had an outside expert analyze the controlled reading (common texts) samples using Clay's (1991) Running Record. The

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

outside expert was a practicing Reading Recovery teacher who was highly recommended by the regional Reading Recovery teacher trainer. Previous work with this expert (Author, 1992) confirmed that she was extremely capable. This analysis produced information on strategies, including oral reading errors, self-corrections, fluency, intonation cross-checking cues, decoding, and stance responses such as effort, and persistence. Results also include accuracy rate, error rate, and self-correction rate when sufficient text was read. All these factors contribute to demonstration of strategy use and a stance toward reading. For example, they show the strategies the child knew and used and the effort and persistence exhibited in the face of challenge. The researchers studied the reading samples and the expert's results and reached consensus on them.

In both analyses, memos were written about children's reading behaviors and our data-based interpretations of them. (See Appendix A for a data narrative sample.) Finally, we compared across classroom cites to answer the question "Do children's reading strategy use and stance toward literacy differ in the instructional settings?" Our data reveals that they did.

Results

These results presented below include findings on children's strategies and stance within two contexts, viz, a controlled reading event imposed by the researchers, and the regularly occurring independent reading in the classroom.

Controlled Reading Samples

In January of first grade the children were taken aside and asked to read one of two versions of an *I Can Read* text (Bonsall, 1963, 1965). These texts turned out to be quite difficult for all but the most proficient readers. In the following discussion learners from the skill-based classrooms are discussed first followed by learners from the whole language classrooms {i.e. Audrey (S-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

B) and Charlie (WL), Mary Ann (S-B) and Jason (WL) , and Rodney(S-B) and Ann (WL) }. Matched case studies Audrey and Charley are presented first.

Audrey's (S-B) accuracy rate of 66% and her substitutions with high use of visual cues showed application of alphabetic knowledge. However, her reading was not fully conventional in January. Other cueing system information and Audrey's stance (shown in the ways Audrey took on the challenge of reading, e.g. persistence) indicated that she was not using her knowledge effectively.

Text	Audrey's Reading
Snitch was yelling. He was pulling a wagon with a funny thing in it. And he was yelling.	Snitch was yelling he has. . . . . . . .He was /pul ling/ . . . . . .a . . .. (she asks for help and begins again) Snitch was yelling. . . he was /pelling/ a wagon with a funny think in it. And he was yelling.
"Stop yelling, " yelled his brother, Wizard. "Stop yelling," yelled his friend Skinny. "Stop yelling," yelled his friend Tubby.	Stop yelling, yelled his brothers. We stopped. . /weed/ stopped yelling, yelled his friends. / Sk sk sk . . . skitty/ stopped yelling. Yelled his friends . . . /tube/

In this reading sample, Audrey showed a controlled repertoire of known words and an impulsive approach (revealed in intonation). Audrey's self-correction rate was relatively low (one to sixteen). Although she began the reading with efforts to make sense (e.g., re-reading), intonation and self-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

monitoring behaviors indicate that she became discouraged and gave up. Audrey stopped reading on the fourth page; her stance did not indicate persistence or multiple strategy use.

Charlie's (WL) accuracy rate of 90% and his substitutions showed high use of letter/sound cues, conventional reading, and effective use of alphabetic knowledge. Use of other cueing systems and a high degree of fluency was also evident. Self- monitoring indicated reflection but he was not entirely consistent. Charlie's self-correction rate was relatively high (one to four) and the ways in which he read showed a positive stance; he manipulated the text through effective strategy use (e.g., self-correcting). His intonation and fluency indicated a synergistic application of cueing system information.

Text	Charlie's Reading
They all sat in the clubhouse. Wizard and Tubby, Skinny and Snitch.	They all sat on in the clubhouse. /Wiz-ard/ Wizard and /Tu/ Tubby...Skinny and Snitch.
Wizard was the leader. Tubby was his pal. Skinny was his pal. Snitch was his little brother.	Wizard was the leader. Tubby was his paw (child mis-pronounced for pal). Skinny was his paw. Snitch was his little brutter. (child mis-pronounced for brother)
Wizard knew a lot, so he was called Wizard. Tubby ate a lot, so he was called Tubby.	Wizard knew a lot, so he was called Wizard. Tubby ate a lot so he was called Tubby.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Skinny did not eat a lot so he was called Skinny. Snitch was called Snitch because he told on his brother. Sometimes.	Skinner did not eat a lot, so he was called Skinny. Snitch was called Snitch because he told on his brutter (child mis-pronounced for brother). Sometimes.

Charlie consistently read for meaning, used letter/sound relationship knowledge actively (e.g. 'Tu' for Tubby) and he persisted in reading 18 pages before the researcher stopped him due to his obvious fatigue.

Mary Ann's (S-B) reading did not yield an accuracy rate due to the brevity of her reading. Her behaviors indicated emergent, and aspectual reading (Sulzby,1985). However, Mary Ann's frequent use of the first letter to make a match with the unknown word indicated that she had alphabetic knowledge and tried to apply it even though this was not very effective.

Text	Mary Ann's Reading
Snitch was yelling. He was pulling a wagon with a funny thing in it. And he was yelling.	(Child looks at print for several seconds.)
Researcher prompts, give her the word Snitch.	
	Snitch (Child looks at the board and begins to copy it.)
Researcher prompts, "Try to read this."	
	Snitch (pauses about 30 seconds) Snitch (another 30

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	second pause)
Researcher reads first sentence.	
to Mary Ann. "Snitch was yelling."	Snitch was yelling. Heeeeee
He was pulling a wagon with a funny	was .....Snitch was .....
thing in it. And he was yelling	Snitch was .....putting a.....
	wagon.....(sv) /puw .....
	.....(sv) /page/ .....(about
	one minute silence)_
	Snitch yelled.....yelling.....
Researcher: "Would you like to	yelling.....yellllll to his bro...his
try the next page.	(Child looks around the room.)

At the beginning of Mary Ann's reading her substitutions revealed use of meaning and structure cues and a brief effort to read for meaning (e.g. re-reading). With a text that was beyond her ability level, Mary Ann did not persist; she read about 20 words on pages one and two. The immediate response to copy a word from the board and her long silences indicated avoidance. Mary Ann's stance was negative, showing avoidance and little effort to engage. When confronted with a difficult task, she did what she could comfortably do: copy and wait.

Jason's (WL) reading yielded less than 50% accuracy. His actions most clearly indicated aspectual reading (Sulzby,1985) with very high use of letter/sound cues.

Text	Jason's Reading
They all sat in the clubhouse	The . . (" I'm stuck on this
Wizard and Tubby,	word." said to himself) . . . all sat
Skinny and Snitch.	in the clubhouse. We . . way . . .
	/inaudible/ and Tubby.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	. . . Sick -y and /inaudible/
Wizard was the leader.	/Wiz-uh /...../inaudible/
Tubby was his pal.	Tub-ble was his /po/.
Skinny was his pal.	/sh/ Snick was /inaudible/
Snitch was his little brother.	Snick . . . was his /lite/ /ltelly/...

Unlike Mary Ann (SB), who came to a complete stop when encountering unknown words, Jason (WL) proceeded in this reading even though he didn't know the words. His strong focus on letter/sound relations (e.g. 'Sick- y' for Skinny) resulted in word calling and sometimes just making approximations to words by saying beginning letter sounds (e.g., 'way' for Wizard). This behavior indicated he had alphabetic knowledge and applied it with much vigor, but that his use of this cueing system was not yet effective.The outside expert indicated in her narrative account on Jason's reading that he saw groups of words pretty well and might well be able to visually analyze much better with a text more appropriate to his ability. She interpreted his extensive use of letter/sound cues as way of coping. In this analysis, Jason's focus on letter/sound cues rendered his reading with little or no attention to meaning. Yet, in a text that was beyond his ability level, Jason read over nine pages; his stance was persistent and effortful.

Rodney (S-B) read only the sight words he knew, indicating an early emergent reading response with little or no risk taking.

Text	Rodney's Reading
Snitch was yelling.	(Child asks for first word and it
He was pulling a wagon	is given.) Snitch . . . he . a . . .
with a funny thing in it.	with . . . . . he . . .
And he was yelling.	/sh/ . . . a in it. And . . . he.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Stop yelling," yelled his brother,	Stop . . . yea . . . . . his. . .
Wizard.	stop. . . . yell . .his. . .stop yell
"Stop yelling," yelled his friend Skinny.	his.
"Stop yelling," yelled his friend Tubby.	

Rodney's (SB) reading provided no evidence of alphabetic knowledge and no use of reading strategies (other than asking for help). Rodney showed no effort to read for meaning or use syntactic information. He read approximately 40 words as turned the pages and skipped whole pages in a search for words he knew. His stance was not positive; he showed efforts to get finished quickly but did not show reflective engagement or courage to take on a text that was very challenging.

Ann's (W-L) reading showed early emergent behaviors as well. She integrated a strong focus on letter/sound relations along with invented text. Her responses resulted in a disjointed reading that was complex but inconsistent with the text. She engaged well (e.g., staying with the task) and manipulated the text using several strategies, e.g. letter/sound relations, inventing text, and self correcting.

Text	Ann's Reading
They all sat in the clubhouse.	They.....in....is in the house. /We/
Wizard and Tubby, Skinny and	Wayne is....
Snitch.	
Researcher redirects and says,	
"Wayne is in the")	Ann: can skip that?
Researcher, " It's up to you."	(Child begins immediately) ...in .
	...is....play... looks at grass. Looks

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	at grass all day.
Wizard was the leader. Tubby was his pal. Skinny was his pal. Snitch was his little brother.	Wayne....Wayne is reading...there he went....Wayne is a friend he went and looks. (She says to herself, " He is doing different things." a comment on the pictures)
Researcher: Yes he is, what do you think?	("He is laying down and / inaudible/)
Wizard knew a lot, so he was called Wizard. Tubby ate a lot so he was called Tubby.	And ....dad.....goes he.....and friends.. goes .....he and ...and Wayne was in he ..and Wayne...goes we.

Ann's rendition of the text showed a strong use of picture clues to help create meaning (e.g., she reads, "looks at grass"). Many of her responses were consistent with the illustrations and also showed use of syntactic knowledge. At the beginning of the reading, she made an effort to make sense (e.g, reads "Wayne is reading" for "Wayne was the leader"). However, this did not last as Ann became overwhelmed with this text. Her substitutions at the beginning letter level indicated evidence of alphabetic knowledge (e.g., 'We' for Wizard), but she could not orchestrate this information. Ann's stance was positive; she persisted reading 8 pages and she consistently applied her limited strategies. Moreover, she was willing to carry on and stopped only at the researcher's' request (because of Ann's fatigue).

The outcomes on the controlled oral reading events indicated general similarities in development in learning to read across the matched case studies. There were also differences by instructional orientation within the matched case studies' stance toward literacy and their strategy use. In the complex patterning

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of reading behaviors (Clay, 1979) the developmental stage of learning to read transacts with motivated-related responses such as perseverance, courage, and taking initiative in the face of challenging text. Yet, careful comparisons can tease apart some of these complex factors. The comparative findings above are summarized as follows.

Audrey (S-B) and Charlie (WL) were the only children who read conventionally. Charlie evidenced a more positive stance through his persistence; his strategy knowledge and application was greater, e.g. higher levels of self-correction and more accuracy.

Both Mary Ann (S-B) and Jason (WL), read aspectually (Sulzby,1985) with Jason's responses clearly reflecting decoding strategies. Mary Ann's stance was passive; she did not take on the task of trying to read nor show effort to apply strategies for any length of time. In contrast, Jason applied his strategies with vigor, persisting in this challenging situation.

Rodney (S-B) and Ann (WL) read in early emergent ways, with Ann showing more effort to construct meaning. Her stance was positive. Ann struggled but did not give up; she attended to each page and showing persistence in efforts to make sense. Rodney's stance was different, e.g. he had alphabetic knowledge (shown in test scores) but did not attempt to apply when he read, nor did he show signs of trying to construct meaning.

In every case the children from the constructivist-based/whole language classroom read far longer than the children from the skill-based classroom. Considering the circumstances of the reading event this outcome is interesting.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The matched case studies read highly similar texts, and they were very similar in development in learning to read (Biemiller, 1970; Mason, 1984; Sulzby, 1985). Yet , the level of courage, persistence, and application of strategies was clearly different, with the whole language children having greater breadth in knowing what it takes to be a reader and greater willingness to try. It is reasonable to infer that this positive stance contributes in important ways to becoming a reader. Such differences would not be captured on standardized or normed measures of reading. Under difficult circumstances for any first-grader, the whole language children saw the text as an object upon which they could reflect and act.

Classroom Reading

The following results are from routine oral classroom readings which took place in the two first grades from January to May. It was during this period that all the children actually moved into conventional reading. Findings are on independent reading. Although the level of proficiency in reading differed by the end of first grade, all the children were able to read some texts conventionally. However, it is important to note that Rodney (S-B), the least proficient child, demonstrated conventional reading only with the one storybook he consistently self-selected throughout the entire first-grade year. In his skills-based classroom children could read tradebooks on their own while the teacher attended to morning paperwork.

In the following discussion the order of presentation of matched case studies is: Audrey (S-B) and Charlie (WL), Mary Ann (S-B) and Jason (WL), and Rodney (S-B) and Ann (WL). One reading sample is provided for each child. We present these data in terms of the children's development in reading, beginning with the most advanced matched case studies, Audrey and Charlie. All children are reading independently.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Audrey (S-B) read her basal in the following representative event.

Text	Audrey's Reading
Oh look. Here is something big	Oh, look. Here is something big. I can
can play with it. I can make go.	play with it. I can make it over
	(over inserted). See me run.
See me run. And see it go up.	And see it go up. Up, up, Up, up, up.
Look at it go. Oh my, oh my.	up. Look at it go. Oh my, oh my. Oh my.
Oh my. I can go up too.	...I can ..(repeating) I can go up to /here/
I go up up and away.	I go up up and away.
Look. Look down. Look down.	Look. Look down. Look down.
I see clothes. I see my house.	I see clothes. I see my house.
I see my mother. Mother, mother	I see my mother. Mother, mother look
up here, look at me go.	up here, look at me go.
See what I can do. Mother, mother.	See what I can do. Mother, mother.
You can not do that. Come down	You can not do that. Come down
here to me.	here to me. (Child says in aside, "I
	wouldn't.")
This is fun. It is fun up here.	This is fun. It is fun up here.
Look at me go. Away away away.	Look at me go. Away, away, away.
Now I see my school. It is a big one	Now I see my school. It it is a big one
but it looks little. And the boys and	but it looks little. And the boys and girls
girls look little too. This is funny	look little too. They (inserted for this)
	is funny. (Audrey paused, looked at the
	picture and began to read again.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

On her own with familiar texts, Audrey (S-B) was accurate and fluent, and she displayed a variety of strategies. As shown above, Audrey read parts of books fluently and made substitutions that were meaningful and consistent with letter/sound relations. Audrey also showed a positive stance and seemed to objectify text (e.g. her playful aside in the second paragraph). On some other occasions she read parts of the text accurately, or she focused rather exclusively on letter/sound cues. Audrey was a strong reader in her skills-based classroom, and she focused on constructing meaning when she read on her own.

Like Audrey (SB), Charlie (WL) was considered among the top readers in his classroom. He read accurately, fluently, and by Spring of first grade sometimes silently indicating he had "inner-control" of the reading process (Clay, 1991). Charlie's substitutions indicated use of organized cueing systems.

The following sample is a representative example from Charlie's reading an entire picture book.

Text	Charlie's Reading
A stormy sky, an old bent tree;	A stormy sky, an old beet (for bent) tree;
I can't quite see. Who's hiding here?	I can't quite see. Who's hiding here? (Talking to himself as if predicting what comes next, "An owl, no I mean, I can see him right there, a moth. Right there he is - - that's a clue." He points to the picture).
Golden stars are sharp and bright.	Golden stars are sharp and bright.
But look two moons, that can't be	But look two moons, that can't be right.
Who's hiding?	Who's hiding? (Charlie whispers as if to answer the question, "A black cat.")

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Quiet nighttime, quiet friend,	Quiet nighttime, quiet friend,
soon the earth will turn again.	soon the earth will turn again.
Stars will fade and sun will rise	Stars will fade and sun will rise
and I will find some new surprise.	and I will find some new surprise.
Hide by sun, and hide by moon,	Hide by sun, and hide by moon,
but I will watch and see you soon.	but I will watch and see you soon.

Charlie notes as he finishes the book and looks at the end pages which illustrate a star filled night sky, "Boy this sure has lots of comets!"

Like Audrey (S-B), Charlie (WL) read with persistence, and both children in this matched case study had a positive stance. Charlie, however, differed from Audrey in the intensity of engagement with the text as shown by more extensive comments. In this case his engagement could have been due to the quality of this book. However, it was not unusual for Charlie to read in this way with a variety of texts. He consistently objectified, reflected, and commented on texts as he read.

Mary Ann's (SB) primary reading strategy often was to read only the words she knew. Her use of letter/sound information (decoding) was inconsistent. However, as the school year drew to a close Mary Ann learned more sight words and read more connected texts.

The following representative sample reveals Mary Ann's independent reading strategies with a book her teacher read, but she had read on her own.

Text	Mary Ann's Reading
Old bear	Old Bear (Child reads the title of the book, looks at the first page, mouths some words, and flips to the second

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	page. Mary Ann turns and talks to a friend, shows the researcher her quarter, and begins to read again.)
A very long time ago, he had seen his good friend Old Bear being packed away in a box. Then he was taken up a ladder, through a trap door and into the attic. The children were being too rough with him and he needed somewhere safe to go for a while.	A old beat /been duh been/ (whispers to herself, "Can't read.") good old bear good old..... (Mary Ann continues to look at pictures and saying, "old bear," and reading a word here and there. Then she reads the same part again.) A old bear.../been/ put...put...put away in a box. Then he has (for word <u>was</u>) (Child stops reading and yawns.)

In reading independently Mary Ann (S-B) used rereading and picture clues. She wanted to read and chose this book on her own, but she seemed to depend on reading the words she knew, showing few strategies to keep the reading going in effortful ways. Her stance toward reading seemed passive, she did not apply strategies she knew, nor show perseverance.

In independent reading Jason's (WL) strategies included self-correction, and showed use of syntactic, letter/ sound, and semantic cues. He read some text fluently and accurately and used a combination of strategies to read other parts of the story. By the end of the school year, he increased the amount of new text read accurately and fluently.

The following sample is from a new library book reading. Audio taping stopped after Jason (WL) read 11 pages; however, he read the entire book.

Text	Jason's Reading
The man gave him sticks, and the	The man gave him (the) sticks, and the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

little pig built a house. Then along came the wolf, knocked at the door and he called out, "Little pig, let me in." "No, no, by the hair of my chinny chin, chin," answered the little pig.	little pig built a house. Then along came came the wolf, knocked (3 sec. pause) (skips words) and he (skips words) little pig (skips words and turns the page).
"Then I'll huff, and I'll puff and I'll blow your house in," said the wolf.	Then I'll huff, then I'll huff (for puff) and I'll blow (pronounced BLOooo) your house in. (skipped words)
So he huffed, and he puffed, and he huffed and he puffed, and at last he blew the house in.	So he puffed (for huffed) and he.. huffed (for puffed) and he huffed and he puffed and he at last he blew the house in. (modified self-correct {at last}).
But the second little pig had slipped out the back door and hidden in the thicket.	But the stick, but the sticks little /pi/ But the second little pig had spent (for slipped) out ....the back...door and hadden (for hidden) in the ... (about 5 sec. pause and turns page)

Jason (WL) was a reader with a positive stance. As he read this new library book Jason often smiled and used reading intonation that indicated personal involvement and reflection (e.g., his pronouncing of word blow). Strategy use, such as self-correction and decoding, were consistent. He demonstrated effortful reading shown in rereading and the length of time he read (Jason finished the story and indicated he was tired but happy. He stretched, looked at the researcher, grinned and said "Phew.").

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Rodney's (S-B) strategies were limited (e.g. inventing text, using the pictures more extensively), and he did not usually apply letter/sound information. Independently, Rodney was observed reading only one storybook throughout the first-grade year. The following reading sample was taken when Rodney (S-B) read some of his favorite storybook. Before he began to read Rodney interacted with the researcher. He got the book and asked, "What's her name?" (pointing to the girl in the inside cover). "Alice," said the researcher. (Rodney looked at the picture for several minutes.) "Eddie" said the researcher (providing the first word in the story).

Text	Rodney's Reading
Eddie was bored. There was nothing to do. If only he had a comic book! But he didn't. Let's play monster Eddie said to Alice.	Eddie...was...bored...where are (He pauses and watches others for a moment and begins to read) There was /nut/ nothing ...to do. (He points to the word if, asks for help, then he skips words.) He had a.. (He is interrupted by a question from his teacher and begins to read again.) He had /k k k/ come (for comic,) (He is interrupted by an announcement to the class. Rodney turns to play with something on his desk and in a few moments begins to read again.) book...But he didn't play monster Eddie said to Elsie (for Alice)
Researcher says, "Do the best you can."	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	(Intonation indicates he is not reading for meaning.)
Don't bother me, I'm watching TV, said Alice.	Don't bother me I'm watching TV said Alice. (Intonation is more meaningful.)
Eddie looked out the window. Don't bother me, I'm watching TV. said Alice.	Eddie looked out the window - (skips words and stops) -

Rodney (S-B) then talked to his neighbor about something unrelated to the story. He began reading again after the researcher asked him to continue. In independent readings of his favorite storybook, Rodney seemed to sometimes read for meaning. As time went by, however, Rodney became less and less engaged with reading. His stance became extremely negative; he was a passive reader and seemed depressed. Although he sometimes read conventionally, much of his reading still showed imbalanced strategies. That is, he did not consistently use orchestrated cueing information (Sulzby,1985; Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987). Much of his reading lacked appropriate intonation was word-by-word and did not have punctuation effect.

Like Rodney (S-B), Ann (WL) also read with strategies imbalanced much of the time. However, Ann used a variety of strategies. She re-read a great deal, and skipped unknown words. During the latter months of first grade, Ann used and overused letter/sound information as she began to read conventionally. The following sample shows Ann reading a book that was, for her, a difficult text. Ann's teacher had read this book aloud in the past, but Ann had not read it on her own. Her reading reveals her stance, e.g. the ways in which she always persisted. In this particular episode Ann finished the entire book despite some reading difficulties and several interruptions from other children.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Text	Ann's Reading
Jump frog jump	Jump frog jump (re-reads the title three times) Jump frog jump, jump frog jump, jump frog jump.
This is the frog that was under the fly that climbed out of the water.	This is the frog that was under the fly that climbed out of the water.
How did the frog catch the fly?	How did the frog get away /a-way/? (She goes back and attempts again.) How did the fly, the fly, how did the frog...get.....get ....the fly (Ann's intonation has a questioning sound as if she is not sure.)
Jump frog jump.	Jump frog jump.
(Some children yell in the classroom and interrupt.)	Ann looks up and goes back to reading.
This is the fish that swam after the frog, that was under the fly that climbed out of the water. How did the frog get away?	This is the fish that swam after the frog, that was under the fly that climbed out of the water. How did the frog ge/t/ a -way? (letter t and word away read with letter/sound emphasis)

The example above is representative of Ann reading a text that was a challenge at this time. She demonstrated a pattern of varied strategies and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

reflection (shown in self-correcting, re-reading to make sense and achieve accuracy, intonation, and using and emphasizing letter/sound patterns). Her combined efforts helped Ann sustain reading. At the end of this book she (WL) yawned, stretched, and said, " I'm going to read another book." Then Ann immediately read fluently several short, well-known books. Her stance demonstrated a very engaged and proactive reader who persevered in both challenging and comfortable reading events over an extended time.

The following results summarize the regular classroom reading and mirror the results on controlled reading events discussed earlier. The matched case studies (each with one SB child and one WL child) showed similar development in learning to read. Thus, the stage of reading development did not account for differences. However, there were strategy use and stance differences across the matched case studies (by classroom and instruction) with the skills-based children demonstrating less use of strategies and less positive stances. Again, as discussed earlier, the patterning of complex reading behaviors (Clay, 1979; 1991) transacts in both cognitive and motivation-related ways as reading occurs inside the heads and hearts of children. While teasing these factors apart is possible, every analysis has its limitations. We are aware of the fact that only the observable signs of deep-reading processes are available to researchers. With that caution in mind, we can say the following:

> Audrey (S-B) and Charlie (WL) seemed well on their way to becoming successful readers. Their development was advancing and both had positive stances.
>
> Mary Ann (S-B) and Jason (WL) had moved from aspectual reading to conventional, yet, Mary Ann differed in her passivity. By contrast, Jason consistently applied his knowledge with much

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

interest and initiative. His stance was clearly more positive.

Rodney (S-B) and Ann (WL) seemed well on their way to conventional reading, although Ann showed more progress. Her stance was far more positive; Ann worked hard at reading and consistently applied a re-reading strategy to gain momentum and stay with the reading when challenged.

Conclusion and Discussion

The findings in this study contribute to the knowledge base on emergent to conventional reading development. Past research (Biemiller, 1970; Clay, 1992; Dyson, 1991, Ehri, Griffith, & Gough, 1986; Lomax & McGee, 1988; Sulzby, 1985) documented specific developmental learning-to-read stages. Our investigation built on the literature and provides additional information on the complexities of emergent to conventional reading development on two levels, namely children's use of reading strategies and their stance toward literacy. These complexities were visible through careful comparisons of children who were matched according to beginning school knowledge and reading development, but in different instructional settings. By accounting for factors known to effect reading (grade-level, cultural and instructional background, reading proficiency, beginning knowledge) we conducted a study of children's reading in two kinds of classrooms. The differences found showed the children from the constructivists-based/whole language background had more strategy use and more positive stances than their comparison cases. The intellectual environment of this classroom had an effect on children's learning.

The motivation-related literature documents the importance of our findings (Corno & Snow, 1986; Corno & Rohrkemper, 1985; Oldfather & Dahl,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1994; Deci & Ryan, 1987; 1991; Turner, 1995, Wittrock, 1986). Moreover, the merging fields of literacy research and motivation (Almasi, McKeown, & Beck, 1996; Bergin, & LaFave, in press; Oldfather & Dahl, 1994; Turner, 1985; _____& Author, 1995; Author, 1995) increasingly validate the importance of research on young children's cognitive and affective development in learning to read. The current study contributes to the claim proposed by Oldfather and Dahl (1994), and that of Bergin & Lafave (in press) by providing evidence that affective learning co-occurs as children acquire reading skills. Importantly, learning differed between the cases according to classroom instruction. Our findings indicate the characteristics of whole language philosophy and practice are congruent with factors such as positive, personal agency beliefs. Such beliefs underpin strategic action and literacy stance.

This investigation contributes to the work of Sulzby and Teale (1991) on children's learning to objectify and reflect on written language. Our findings show that beyond development in learning to read, instructional environments are important. In this study the influence of instruction cuts across reading development. In the reality of classroom practice and the literate lives of children, the mental and psychological constructs cannot be separated. Good teachers have always worked to support both. We turn now to a discussion of instruction and further conclusions of this study.

Instructional Implications

Intrinsic motivation is highly desirable and is one of the major concerns of classroom teachers (Baumann, Allen, Schockley, 1994). Based on the current investigation and other studies cited throughout this article we suggest that teachers look for research that includes both literacy skills and motivation-related responses. For primary-grade teachers, a developmental perspective seems critical. No one-best-method will cause all children to be

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

developmentally similar and at the top of the range in learning to read. However, instruction can improve for all children when informed teachers make their own instructional decisions (Rich, 1985; Author and _____, in press) based on research.

The characteristics that the whole language children demonstrated contribute to the development of the "inner control" (Clay, 1991) which is defined as a self-extending, self-improving system whereby children use multiple sources of text information and are rewarded by the reading process itself. In short they become real readers. Becoming a real reader is particularly crucial for low-income and minority populations. Many children in these populations learn to read; however, far too few become readers with a positive stance toward literacy.

In the transmission and skills-based classroom in this study a pre-determined scope and sequence controlled the knowledge that was available to the children. Texts were limited and teachers' interactions nearly scripted. Instruction of this sort is rigid for children who must learn to adapt and be flexible in order to become competent and pro-active readers. We know that readers at risk usually do nothing more than a minimum to get by and that children who give up become problem readers (Clay, 1991). In contrast, children in the whole language classroom had access to quality literature and were afforded varied opportunities for self-selection and to learn reading strategies (from the teacher and peers). The teacher of this group also encouraged self-reliance and demonstrated the expectation that the children would take a positive stance toward literacy.

While no teacher or instruction is perfect, certain aspects of instruction based on current learning theory can provide children with access to a broader knowledge base (Au, 1997; Bergin & Lafave, in press; Cambourne, 1988; Clay,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1990; Purcell-Gates, 1995; Tharp & Gallimore, 1993). Teachers can gradually incorporate the characteristics of a constructivist-based philosophy into their classroom while retaining what they see as valuable in their current teaching. Those who already have a constructivist philosophy will improve their teaching expertise by building on this base.

Suggestions for Research

In search of the best method the field of reading research has compared instruction. Some of these studies have focused on standardized tests or other measures of words recognition and/or decoding skills. While word recognition and decoding are important parts of reading, based on this investigation and other research, we believe that comparison studies of these factors are problematic. Such research is not based on what we know about the complexities of literacy learning. More research is called for that includes these complexities, that focuses on diverse and at-risk populations over time, and that closely examines what happens under the labels of specific kinds of instruction. We also need more studies that follow on this one and track the development of a positive stance in the early years and growth in reading proficiency (Author, 1995).

Limitations

This investigation is limited to the low-SES, urban, White Appalachian children we studied. Although the results may resonate with researchers and teacher researchers, the outcomes, like all qualitative results, are not traditionally generalizable. Despite the fact that these teachers and their building principals identified their classrooms as skills-based and whole language, and that several data sources were used to identify the instructional philosophy and practice, each classroom represented a particular instantiation of these kinds of instruction. Finally, gaining insights into the cognitive and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

affective reading processes of young children is problematic; however, the method and analysis used were appropriate for this study. The long-term nature of the study, its multiple data sources, and its method of analysis support its trustworthiness and rigor.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1

Pre and post test findings

Children's pre-tests	I	SS	AP	CP	Children's post test	I	SS	AP	CP
Audrey (S-B)	5	7	1	8	Audrey (S-B)	5	7	8	22
Mary Ann (S-B)	4	3	1	9	Mary Ann (S-B)	5	7	5	17
Rodney (S--B)	1	2	1	7	Robert (S-B)	5	4	3	15
Charlie (WL)	4	5	1	7	Chris (WL)	5	6	8	22
Jason (WL)	2	1	1	3	Jason (WL)	5	4	5	22
Ann (WL)	1	4	1	10	Ann (WL)	5	5	4	19

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REFERENCES

Almasi, J., MCKeown, M. G., Beck, I. L. (1996). The nature of engaged reading in classroom discussions of literature. Journal of Reading Behavior, 28, 107-147.

Au, K. & Carroll, J. H. (1997). Improving literacy achievement through a constructivist approach: The KEEP demonstration classroom project. The Elementary School Journal, 97, 203-221.

Baker, L.,and Brown, A.(1984). Metacogntive skills and reading. In P. D. Pearson, R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, & P. Mostnthal (Eds.), Handbook of Reading Research, Volume I (pp 353-394. New York, NY: Longman.

Bergin, D., & LaFave, C. L. (in press). Continuities between motivation research and whole language approaches to instruction. Journal of Literacy Research.

Berlinger, D. C., & Biddle, D., (1995). The manufactured crisis. Reading, MA: Addision-Wesley.

Biemiller, A. (1970). The development of the use of graphic and contextual information as children learn to read. Research Reading Quarterly, 6, 75-96.

Cambourne, B. (1988). The whole story: Natural learning and the acquisition of literacy in the classroom. New Zealand: Scholastics, Inc.

Clay, M. M. (1991). Becoming literate: The construction of inner control. Ackland, New Zealand: Heinemann.

Clay, M. M., (1979). The early detection of reading difficulties. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Corno, L., & Snow, R. E. (1986). Adapting teaching to individual differences among learners. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching pp. 605-629. New York: Macmillan.

Corno, L., & Rohrkemper, M. (1985). The intrinsic motivation to learn in classrooms. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.), Research on motivation in education: The classroom milieu (Fol. 2, pp 53-90).

Crosby, B. (1965). The Cat's Meow. New York, NY: Harper and Row

Crosby, B. (1963). The case of the hungry stranger. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Dahl, K. L., & _____. (1995). A comparison of inner-city children's interpretations of reading and writing in the early grades in skills-based and whole language classrooms. Reading Research Quarterly, 30, 50-74.

Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (1991). A motivational approach to self: Integration in personality. In R. Dienstbier (Ed.), Perspectives in Motivation (pp 237-288). Lincoln: Nebraska Symposium on Motivation 1990, University of Nebraska Press.

Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (1987). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. New York: Teachers College Press.

DeFord, D. E. (1985). Validating the construct of the theoretical orientation in reading instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, 20, 351-367.

Dyson, A. H. (1991, February). Viewpoints: The word and the world -- reconceptualizing written language development or do rainbows mean a lot to little girls? Research in the Teaching of English, 25, 97-123.

Dyson, A. H. (1989). Multiple worlds of child writers: Friends learning to write. New York: Teachers' College Press.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Edwards, E., & Mercer, N. (1987). Common Knowledge. New York: Methuen.

Flesh, R. (1956). Why Johnny can't read: And what you can do about it. New York, NY: Harper and Brothers.

Fowler, G. L. (1981). The residential distribution of urban Appalachians. In W. W. Philliber & C. B. McCoy (Eds.), The invisible minority: Urban Appalachians (pp. 79-94). Louisville, KY: The University Press of Kentucky.

_____ (1995). Low-income children's literacy interpretations in a skills-based and a whole language classroom. Journal of Reading Behavior. 505-533.

_____ (1994). Understanding the nature of reading and writing Difficulties: An alternative view. Reading and Writing Quarterly, 10, 227-238.

_____(1991). An investigation of children's concepts of the purpose and nature of reading in different instructional settings. The Journal of Reading Behavior: A Journal of Literacy, 23, 139-163.

Goodman, Y. Watson, D., & Burke, C. (1987). Reading miscue inventory. New York, NY: Richard C. Owen.

Goetz, J. P. & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. New York: Academic Press.

Glaser, B. G. (1978). Theoretical sensitivity. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Green, J. & Meyer, L. (1991). The embeddedness of reading in classroom life: Reading as a situated process. In C. Baker & A. Luke (Eds.), The critical sociology of reading pedagogy (pp. 141-160). The Netherlands: John Benjamin.

Griffin, P., Cole, M., & Newman, D. (1982). Locating tasks in psychology and education. Discourse Processes, 5, 111-125.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Guthrie, J. T., Van Meter, P. McCann A. D., Wigfield, A., Bennett, L. Poundstone C.C., Rice, M. E., Failbisch, F. M., Mitchell, A. M., (1996). Growth of literacy engagement: Changes in motivations and strategies during concept-oriented reading instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, 31, 306-331.

Guthrie, J. T., Schafer, W., Wang, Y., & Afflerbach, P. (1993). Influences of instruction on reading engagement: An empirical exploration of a social cognitive framework of reading activity. Research Report #3. Athens, GA: National Reading Center.

Lyons, N. (1990). Delemmas of knowing: Ethical and epistemologies dimensions of teachers' work and development. Harvard Educational Review, 60, 159-180.

Mason, J. M. (1984). Early reading from a developmental perspective. In P. D. Pearson's (Ed.), Handbook of reading research. (pp. 505-544). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Merriam, S. B., (1988). Case Study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Franciso: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

McKenna, M., C., Robinson, R. d., & Miller, J. W. (1994). Emerging perspectives on whole language. In C. B. Smith (Eds.), Whole language: The debate. (pp. 101-111). Bloomington, IN ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, English, and Communication.

McKenna, M., C., Stahl, S. A., & Reinking, D. (1994). A critical commentary on research politics, and whole language. Journal of Reading Behavior, 26, 211-234.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, M. A. (1984). Qualitative data analysis. Beverly Hills, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Moss, R. K., (1983). Transactions among teachers and children: Instructional behavior and the writing process during classroom writing episodes. Unpublished dissertation. Texas A & M University.

Oldfather,P., & Dahl,K.L. (1994). Toward a social constructivists reconceptulization of intrinsic motivation for literacy learning. Journal of Reading Behavior, 26. 139-158.

_____ (1996). Strategies and skills in whole language: An introduction to Balanced instruction. In E. McIntyre & M. Pressley (Eds.), Balanced instruction: Skills and strategies in whole language (pp 1-20). Norwood, MA: Christopher Gordon.

_____. (1992). Young children's reading behaviors in various classroom contexts. Journal of Reading Behavior: A Journal of Literacy, 24, 339-371.

_____ & _____, (1994). Children's development of alphabetic knowledge in skills-based and whole language classrooms. Research in the Teaching of English,28, 391 - 417.

Miller, L. S., (1995). An American imperative: Accelerating minority educational achievement. New Haven, CT: Yale University.

Rich, S., (1985). Restoring power to teachers: The impact of "whole language." Language Arts, 62, 717-724

Rowe, D. W. (1989). Author/ audience interaction in the preschool: The role of social interaction in literacy lessons. Journal of Reading Behavior: A Journal of Literacy, 21, 311-349.

Paris, S., Wasik, B. A.,& Turner, J.C. (1991). The development of strategic readers.In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), Handbook of Reading Research Volume II, (pp. 727-757). White Plains, NY: Longman.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Pearson, P. D., & Fielding, L. (1991). Comprehension instructio. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), Handbook of Reading Research, Volume II. (pp. 885-910). New York, NY: Longman.

Purcell-Gates, V. (1995). Other people's words: The cycle of low literacy. Harvard University Press.

Purcell-Gates, V. (1989). Written language knowledge held by low-SES, inner city children entering kindergarten. In S. McCormick & J. Zutell (Eds.), Cognitive and social perspectives for literacy research and instruction (pp.95-105). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.

Purcell-Gates, V. & Dahl, K. (1992). Low-SES children's success and failure at early literacy in skills-based classrooms. Journal of Reading Behavior: A Journal of Literacy. 23, 1-34.

Pintrich, P. R., & DeGroot, E. V. (1990). Motivation and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. Journal of of Educational Psychology, 82, 33-40.

Stanovich, K. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. Reading Research Quarterly, 21, 360-406.

Stienberg, J. (1998, Spring). Hybrid reading method urged. The New York Times. p. 1.

Sulzby, E. (1985). Children's emergent reading of favorite storybooks: A developmental study. Reading Research Quarterly, 20, 458-481.

Sulzby E. & Teale, W. (1991). Emergent literacy. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), Handbook of Reading Research Volume II, (pp. 727-757). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1993). Rousing minds to life. New York: Cambridge University Press.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Turner, J. (1995). The influence of classroom contexts on young children's motivation for literacy. Reading Research Quarterly, 30, 410-441.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Mind and society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wittrock , M. C. (1986). Students' thought processes. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook Research on Teaching (pp. 297-314). New York: Macmillan.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A

Sample Data Narrative

Note: This summarizes learner patterns in reading as documented in elaborated field notes (includes artifact information and audio tape information). Data-based interpretations are on strategy use, stance, and stance-related responses.

Name: Jason (first-grade WL classroom) Time period: January Through May

Reading strategy activity (independent)

Jason reads whole books and comments on both the story and his own reading activities. Jason also reads parts of books, and returns to re-read familiar ones. He has strategies and uses them. His miscues indicate self-monitoring (self correcting and repeating words and phrases). His is persistent in working on unknown words and will stop, express fatigue (sighs, or says he is tired) for two or more minutes and begin reading again. Conventional reading is evident. Reads known texts more fluently, and miscues indicate balance,use of alphabetic knowledge. He usually reads independently but sometimes seeks a partner.

Stance pattens (independent)

Jason becomes deeply engrossed and sustains reading. He persists. Can ignore others when reading, tolerates interruptions and returns to the text rapidly. Selects books with care. A telling quote occurred when Jason went to the library (February 6) . He returned and showed me two books. One was a favorite he re-reads frequently. Jason held up his new library book and used it to point to the other book, " I got this new one (in the library) to help me read this one (his favorite)."

He smiles, nods, points to illustrations, turns pages back to look again.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Field note data:

January 16 and 17: Sustained independent reading (completed a familiar trade book and two class-made books). Reading strategies (includes intonation and miscues): skips a word (infrequently) to keep reading going, repeats words (to gain momentum). Stops to "puzzle" over words he doesn't not know. Persists greatly "coaching" himself when he got stumped on a word, he said, " That's not where" (for word when). Sulzby's refusal stage is clear, Jason said, "Gosh I'm stuck on this stupid word." (proactive: goes to one of the best readers in the room and gets help)

February 6 and 13 : Jason demonstrates metacognition about his reading, he said, " I missed a word" he reread the text and said. " I learn to read by watching other people." (motions to his ears and makes turning motions to indicate thinking). Evidence of engagement is clear (he makes personal comments and connects with the book, he is metacognitively aware), e.g. Jason got an Anna Bananna book and said, "I can't read it all, it's got some hard words, I look the pictures, it's got funny pictures. I like that one cause of the brown and black puppies." In this discussion Jason was very matter-a-fact and really enjoyed showing the researcher the book. Reading strategies used: voice print matching when pointing to text, prediction, and elaboration when discussing the book. His intonation shows conventional reading.

March 27 : Evidence on metacognition, pro-active behaviors, persistence, pride/ enjoyment, and strategy use: Jason came to the researcher after reading extensively on his own and with a peer. He said, " Guess what we read 62 pages and we didn't even know we could read it (shows the book)." " And guess what when we came to a word we didn't know we just worked it out and looked at the beginning and end." I asked him how he learned to do that and he said, " I've been looking at Dr. Seuss books for a long time." I asked him what

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

he would learn next, Jason was quiet for a minute or two and then he said, " I though that was all there was to it!" (big smile on his face, seems so confident)

May 17 : Reading strategies: Jason uses letter/sound relationships consistently. Strives to make sense when reading. Questions self when reading.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE